

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington DC 20554

In the Matter of:

Expedited Consideration for Declaratory Rulings)	
On the transfer of traffic only under AT&T)	
Tariff Section 2.1.8, and Related Issues.)	
)	
Primary Jurisdiction Referral)	
from the NJ District Court)	
)	CCB/CPD 96-20
)	DA – 06-2360
)	WC Docket No. 06-210
One Stop Financial, Inc)	
Group Discounts, Inc.)	
Winback & Conserve Program, Inc.)	
800 Discounts, Inc.)	
Petitioners)	
)	
and)	
AT&T Corp.)	
Respondent)	

Sept 14th, 2007
Commission's Secretary
Marlene H. Dortch

Case Contact:
Deena Shetler: deena.shetler@fcc.gov
FCC Contractor: fcc@bcpiweb.com

Petitioners Further Comments

Dear Commission Staff

Here as exhibit A is AT&T's September 14th 2007 response to petitioners' counsels letter concerning AT&T's inconsistent tariff interpretation for 2.1.8.

Petitioners were able to show under the tariff how AT&T's bogus interpretation of 2.1.8's joint and several liability provision would lead to summary judgment

regarding the June 1996 infliction of shortfall and termination liability against the end-users.

As the exhibit A shows AT&T is at a loss of tariff evidence to refute the explicit tariff evidence petitioners have provided in its 8/23/07 FCC comments on page 20 under the heading:

**ATT's 2.1.8 Interpretation is so Absurd that
if the Revenue Commitment/S&T Obligations Were Actually Transferred
In Petitioners Previous 1993 and 1994 "Traffic Only" Transfers
AT&T Automatically Losses the June 1996 Shortfall Issue**

By this time the Commission has to realize that AT&T's game at this point is simply to delay.

This is why it is even more imperative that the Commission stop AT&T's delaying games by confirming that the Commission will address petitioner's pending motion to adjudicate the shortfall and discrimination claims that have been before the FCC since **1996**.

Petitioner's would like nothing better than to go back to the District Court and request summary judgment on 1) the "traffic only" transfer issue 2) the June 1996 shortfall and termination infliction issue (i.e. June 17th 1994 issue) 3) the shortfall application illegal remedy infliction issue.

The FCC must consider that petitioner's have already attempted to get before the District Court and were denied by Judge Wigenton. The Jan 12th 2007 FCC order noted that petitioners should go back to the District Court. Petitioners did and were shut out. There are no disputed facts. The FCC must rule on these issues.

AT&T's latest letter is clear indication that it hasn't a tariff leg to stand on and will just keep feeding the Commission nonsense.

We respectfully ask that the Commission take this latest AT&T so called response into consideration in two respects:

- 1) AT&T has no tariff evidence to refute petitioners
- 2) AT&T's position that petitioners are presently stuck with no venue to adjudicate June 1996 S&T issues that petitioners, Tips, the IRS and many aggregators want decided ASAP.

Respectfully Submitted,
One Stop Financial, Inc
Group Discounts, Inc

Winback & Conserve Program, Inc
800 Discounts, Inc.

By: /s/ Al Inga

Al Inga

Its' President